



LPA-1169-2026 (O&M)

-1-

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

119

LPA-1169-2026 (O&M)

Date of decision: 06.05.2026

DIVYA KAUSHIK

...APPELLANT

VERSUS

**PUNJAB STATE COUNCIL FOR SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY
AND ANOTHER**

...RESPONDENTS

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASGURPREET SINGH PURI
HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE AMARJOT BHATTI**

Present: Mr. G.S. Bal, Senior Advocate assisted by
Mr. Avtar Singh, Advocate
for the appellant.

Mr. Krishan Singh Dadwal, Advocate
for respondents No. 1 and 2.

Mr. Gaurav Tangri, Advocate
for Caveator.

JASGURPREET SINGH PURI, J. (Oral)

1. The present is Letters Patent Appeal being filed against the interim orders dated 23.03.2026 and 06.04.2026 passed by learned Single Judge. Both these orders are interlocutory orders passed by learned Single Judge and writ petition is already pending before learned Single Judge.

2. Learned Senior Counsel appearing on behalf of the appellant who is also the petitioner in the writ petition which is still pending before learned Single Judge has submitted that the appellant was appointed to the post of Scientist (Patent Information Centre) on contractual basis vide Annexure P-6 dated 09.02.2011 and her tenure was extended from time to



time and submitted that writ petition was filed seeking quashing of an order whereby the post of Scientist (PIC) which was held by the appellant was illegally abolished with other reliefs which were sought in the writ petition. On 16.07.2024, learned Single Judge had passed an order by granting status quo as on 30.06.2024. However, an application was moved by respondents for preponement and for vacation of stay order in which learned Single Judge vide order dated 23.03.2026 modified the aforesaid order dated 16.07.2024 to the extent that in case the project is extended beyond 31.03.2026, status-quo will continue to operate and if project is not extended beyond 31.03.2026, then respondents would not be bound by the said interim order dated 16.07.2024, as it will create financial obligation on the respondents to pay her salary beyond the expiry of the project and in this way aforesaid order of status-quo dated 16.07.2024 was modified by learned Single Judge by passing of the aforesaid impugned interim order. Thereafter, an application was filed seeking recalling of aforesaid order before learned Single Judge which was also dismissed vide order dated 06.04.2026, which is also assailed in present appeal.

3. Learned Senior Counsel submits that after 31.03.2026, services of appellant have been dispensed with and in fact the project is still in continuation because it is not the project which was to be discontinued, but it is the grant which was to be given by the Central Government from year to year basis which may not have been received by the respondents but that does not mean that project itself has been completed and therefore, impugned orders are liable to be set aside.



4. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of respondents has submitted that on the application filed by respondents before learned Single Judge, status-quo was granted earlier on 16.07.2024 which was rightly modified in view of the fact that project was to be completed on 31.03.2026 and in fact, it has been completed.

5. Learned counsel further submits that Mr. Krishan Kant Singla, Principal Scientific Officer, Punjab State Council for Science and Technology, Sector-26, Chandigarh is present in the Court and submits that he has instructions to state on behalf of the aforesaid Officer that project on which the appellant was working was under the name of “Patent Information Centre” and it was for a duration of five years only and this project has already been completed on 31.03.2026 and therefore, services of appellant were not required and since the project itself not been extended beyond 31.03.2026 as it has been completed, present appeal is liable to be dismissed.

6. We have learned counsel(s) for the parties.

7. Present appeal has been filed against the interim orders passed by learned Single Judge and admittedly, writ petition is still pending before learned Single Judge. Perusal of impugned order would show that on 16.07.2024, learned Single Judge has granted status-quo as on 30.06.2024. On the application moved by respondents, aforesaid status-quo was modified and it was also clarified that in case the project is extended beyond 31.03.2026 then status-quo will continue to operate and if it is not extended beyond 31.03.2026, then respondents would not be bound by the said interim order dated 16.07.2024. Today, specific



statement has been made by learned counsel appearing on behalf of respondents on the basis of categorical instructions received from the aforesaid Officer present in the Court that the aforesaid project has not been extended beyond 31.03.2026 as it has been completed.

8. During the course of arguments, learned counsel appearing on behalf of respondents has also apprised this Court that reply was filed by the respondents before learned Single Judge along with various annexures which have not been annexed with the present Letters Patent Appeal and he also referred to the offer of contractual appointment of the appellant dated 03.07.2024, whereby she was appointed to the post of Project Scientist-II on contract basis and has also referred to paragraph No. 13 of the aforesaid appointment letter which so provides that the contract is liable to be terminated on the ground of expiry of term of the project under which she was appointed. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of respondents submits that since appointment was co-extensive with that of the project and the project has already been completed, even otherwise also the services could not have been extended.

9. We are of the considered view that not only that present appeal is liable to be dismissed on the ground that in present Letters Patent appeal, the interim orders passed by learned Single Judge have been assailed and writ petition is still pending but also on the ground that there is no illegality or infirmity in the impugned orders passed by learned Single Judge, wherein interim order dated 16.07.2024 was only modified to the limited extent which was in fact in the nature of conditional order that in case the project is extended beyond 31.03.2026 then status-quo

**LPA-1169-2026 (O&M)****-5-**

will continue to operate and if it is not extended beyond 31.03.2026, then respondents would not be bound by the said interim order dated 16.07.2024 and it has been factually so stated by learned counsel appearing on behalf of respondents on the instructions from Officer present in the Court that project has not been extended beyond 31.03.2026 and in terms of aforesaid paragraph No. 13 of appointment letter that services of appellant being contractual in nature but co-terminus with that of the project which itself has been completed.

10. In view of the aforesaid facts and circumstances, this Court is of the considered view that there is no ground available for interference in the present Letters Patent Appeal and the same is hereby dismissed.

11. Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

(JASGURPREET SINGH PURI)
JUDGE

06.05.2026
lalit

(AMARJOT BHATTI)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	:	Yes/No